

Planning Commission **Meeting Minutes**

April 9, 2015 City Hall, Council Chambers 749 Main Street

6:30 PM

Call to Order – Chairman Pritchard called the meeting to order at 6:30 P.M.

Roll Call was taken and the following members were present:

Commission Members Present: Chris Pritchard, Chairman

Ann O'Connell, Secretary

Steve Brauneis Jeff Moline Tom Rice Scott Russell

Commission Members Absent:

Cary Tengler, Vice Chairman

Staff Members Present:

Troy Russ, Director of Planning and Building Safety

Scott Robinson, Planner II

Approval of Agenda –

Moline made motion and O'Connell seconded to approve the agenda. Motion passed by voice vote.

Approval of Minutes -

O'Connell submits one correction. Brauneis made motion and Rice seconded to approve March 12, 2015 minutes. Motion passed by voice vote.

Public Comments: Items not on the Agenda None.

Regular Business - Public Hearing Items

- Grain Elevator Final Plat and PUD and SRU: (Louisville Mill Site, LLC.) Resolution No. 14, Series 2015 - A Resolution recommending approval of a final plat, final Planned Unit Development (PUD), and Special Review Use (SRU) to allow for the construction of a new building and additions to two existing buildings totaling 27,000 square feet and allow outdoor sales and activities at the Grain Elevator site, 500-544 County Road.
 - Applicant and Representative: Louisville Mill Site LLC (Erik Hartronft)
 - Owners: City of Louisville and RCC LTD
 - Case Manager: Scott Robinson, Planner II

Conflict of Interest and Disclosure:

None.

Public Notice Certification:

Published in the Boulder Daily Camera on March 22, 2015. Posted in City Hall, Public Library, Recreation Center, and the Courts and Police Building and mailed to surrounding property owners and property posted on March 20, 2015.

Staff Report of Facts and Issues:

Scott Robinson presented from Power Point:

- Located on south side of Louisville, east side of County Road, and west side of the BNSF railroad tracks.
- Property zoned commercial business and governed by the Louisville Municipal Code (LMC), Downtown Framework Plan, Design Handbook for Downtown Louisville, and the Downtown Sign Manual.
- Two owners who are the City of Louisville for the northern portion housing the Grain Elevator and the former Napa building and RCC for the southern portion housing the warehouse building.
- Final plat would be into three lots and one outlot.
- RCC owner has existing long-term BNSF lease on railroad property used for parking.
 There is a purchase and sale agreement between City of Louisville and Louisville Mill
 Site LLC for the northern portion which includes no public land dedication requirement,
 waived by City Council.
- Additions to two buildings:
 - Lot 1 Warehouse Building: 10,000 SF existing
 - Lot 2 Grain Elevator: 4,000 SF existing + 1,500 SF proposed
 - Lot 3 New Building: demolished and replaced 19,000 SF proposed
- 32,454 square feet leasable area
- Lot coverage and rear setback waiver requests governed by LMC and complies with setbacks except in two places.
 - Lot 1 existing building does not comply with rear setback requirement but no changes to it, requesting waiver for existing setback.
 - Grain Elevator addition to the back will connect two usable ends for one tenant;
 wish to add restrooms and hallway; will technically extend one foot from the lot line but no nearby adjacent use (leased BNSF property and RR tracks).
- Two lots over maximum allowed lot coverage but when site is considered as a whole, the complete site is under the maximum allowed lot coverage.
- Waivers requested for maximum height under Downtown Framework Plan. The site is a transition zone which allows 2 stories and 35 feet. In preliminary PUD, applicant requested 3 stories and 35 feet. Within further plan development and flood plan development permit process, applicant needs to raise the building 2 feet. Applicant is requesting 38 feet height. Defined rooftop screening will take height to 41.5 feet in proposal.
- Parking: 63 parking spaces required, applicant will provide 64 spaces provided with potential for 17 additional spaces. Extended lease for more BNSF land which will add 13 spaces. Applicant proposes 18 spaces will be small car spaces (less than City standard measurement of 19 feet long and 9 feet wide).
- Architecture will echo industrial mining buildings formerly found in Louisville, and similar
 to existing Grain Elevator. Wood siding and Corten corrugated metal roofing and siding
 with moderate feel of glazing and glass. Grain Elevator addition will reconstruct porte
 cochere. Historical Preservation Committee has reviewed the proposal and is in favor of
 design.
- Signage generally complies with Downtown Sign Manual. Requested monument sign not allowed but two freestanding signs can be added at main drive aisles.

SRU is to request outdoor dining, gatherings, sales, and weekend activities on property.
 Staff recommends condition to limit outdoor activity to between 8 am and midnight which is consistent with outdoor dining and activities in Downtown Louisville.

Staff Recommendations:

Staff recommends approval of Resolution 14, Series 2015, recommending approval of a final plat and PUD and SRU for the Grain Elevator site with three conditions:

- 1. The porch at the southwest corner of the Lot 1 building shall be expanded and columns and wood siding elements shall be added with landscaping and trees to further screen the existing building materials.
- 2. The proposed monument sign shall be removed and two freestanding signs shall be allowed, one at each main access drive, with the size, lighting, and detail to comply with the Downtown Sign Manual.
- 3. Outdoor sales and dining shall be limited to between the hours of 8 am and midnight.

Commission Questions of Staff:

Brauneis asks what is driving the conditions for outdoor sales and dining. How does it compare with this zoning typically?

Robinson says the property is adjacent to residential uses so Staff does not want outdoor dining at late hours. This is consistent with the rest of Downtown which has a cut off for outdoor dining at 12 am.

Moline asks what is the height of the Grain Elevator?

Robinson says approximately 50 feet.

Brauneis asks about flood plain issues and the applicant needing to raise the building. Robinson says the City is currently pursuing drainage improvements in this area which could reduce the base flood elevation. If this goes through before the building is constructed, the applicant intends to lower the building back down.

Rice says the building on Lot 2 is already 50 feet tall. Lot 1 on preliminary was approved to 35 feet and to three stories. Final PUD is requesting 38 feet. He asks what was approved for Lot 3 and 35 feet on the preliminary. Lot 3 now is requesting 41.5 feet.

Robinson says Lot 1 is based on requirements meeting the flood plain permit. Lot 3 was approved at 35 feet for building height and three stories, with additional height for screening which had not been defined yet. The proposed building is 38 feet to top of roof with another 3.5 feet for screening mechanical facilities.

Russell asks about outdoor sales and dining. He mentions noise and music. He wonders if more specific language is needed in the condition.

Pritchard wants to Staff to look at Lulu's wording so that requirement is consistent.

Applicant Presentation:

Eric Hartronft, Louisville Mill Site LLC, 950 Spruce Street, Louisville, CO Randy Caranci, RCC Inc., partner present.

Hartronft presents from Power Point:

- Louisville Mill Site LLC purchased land from City of Louisville.
- Property located on south end of Downtown, zoned transition, but different from the rest of transition zone because it is populated with larger buildings.
- Applicant wants to make the Grain Elevator the centerpiece of the development, so it is being restored for commercial uses as well as structurally stabilized.
- Wrap around existing warehouse necessary as well as fill-in of cutout portion with new square footage to create new aesthetic.

Applicant shows aerial pictures of the site of warehouse, Grain Elevator, and old Napa building as well as historical pictures of the property.

- Historic grain elevator before stabilization
- Historic grain elevator in operation early 1910

- Turn of the century Louisville was agrarian and industrial with ACME mine. Proposed PUD site plan:
 - Create open space in front of Grain Elevator to be used as park with picnic tables.
 - Wants to bring Downtown streetscape to Front Street in front of building, transition from attached sidewalk to detached sidewalk.
 - Bring Downtown street lighting to create node at Elm Street (northwest corner) for a
 crosswalk for safe pedestrian crossing. Applicant does not feel there is enough traffic
 calming in the area for cars at higher speeds. Applicant wishes to work with the City and
 LRC regarding lighting.
 - As part of the purchase agreement, the applicant has negotiated a conservation easement to be placed on Outlot A as a "no-build" zone. Applicant does not want buildings placed in front of the Grain Elevator.
 - RCC Inc. has current lease with BVSD for parking which will be continued as well as
 extending the lease to pick up 13 spaces. They are not currently counted in the
 calculations.
 - Site designed to preserve views to Grain Elevator with "no-build" zone and access to utility easements to Lot 2 and Outlot which expands the "no-build" zone.
 - Applicant in contact with Warembourg family regarding donation of historic scales back to the property. They would be installed next to the porte cochere. They currently exist at the Warembourg farm.
 - In addition, there is a small granary existing on the Warembourg farm. Applicant wishes to relocate the small granary near the large Grain Elevator and restore it. It is 11.5 feet height at peak and floor is 14 x 10 feet. When full, small granary held up to 900 bushels; Grain Elevator held over 20,000 bushels.
 - Applicant discusses third story and 35 feet height limit. A two story development was
 explored which would mean expanding the footprints. It would impede into the view
 shed of the Grain Elevator. It is superior to make the buildings more compact, less
 spread out, and up to 4 to 5 feet over the arbitrary height limit. Height is measured from
 average grade. Site has low spots along the street and property rises to patio in front,
 required because of flood plain issue. Building needed to be pushed out of the flood
 plain.
 - Architectural concept is to celebrate the agrarian history of Louisville as well as provide commercial benefit to the City. The Grain Elevator inside contains a six-pack of grain bins in the middle of the structure, extending below grade to upper area, measuring 45 feet tall and 12 x 14 feet in dimension. The applicant wants to preserve them and upper area as an interpretative historic site. Proposed plan includes a stairway to upper catwalk for viewing. The southern warehouse and the office area are usable space. To connect these areas, the applicant wants to construct an eastern addition for restrooms, small kitchen, and utility areas as well as a western addition. The eastern addition will be fashioned like an old railcar since this is where one would historically be located.
 - HPC has endorsed this proposal.
 - Applicant agrees with the conditions from Staff. Applicant has made the porch at Lot 1
 much larger and brought siding onto the building as backdrop for signage. Different earth
 tone colors will be used. Applicant is okay with loss of monument sign; at each entry
 points to the development, post mounted signs in full compliance are acceptable. The
 hours of operation are agreeable.
 - Applicant discusses items with Public Works regarding flood plain mitigation to storm, sanitary, and sewer.
 - Applicant states that all overhead utility lines on and off the site would be underground.
 All utilities will be underground on site, but utility lines near the site are too expensive to address.
 Applicant wants Condition that they are not required to do this.

 Applicant mentions installing streetlights on County Road. There currently are three lights mounted on wood poles and are standard cobra heads. Applicant needs financial assistance from the City and LRC in order to afford streetlight installation. Applicant wants Condition regarding lighting.

Commission Questions of Applicant:

Moline asks about flood plain and timing to lower flood plain elevation. Can you lower the northern building? Asks about timing of City improvements and your improvements. Hartronft says it could be lowered 18 inches to 2 feet. The City improvements must go through FEMA. If initial plans are approved for floodway improvement and construction has started, the applicant thinks they will go back to the Board of Adjustments and ask for variance. They are working with Staff.

Brauneis asks about the third floor on the Lot 3 building and setbacks.

Hartronft says the slide is older but he shows where the third floor would be on the building on Lot 3. He shows how the roofs "contain" the third floor.

Russell asks about building on Lot 3 and the front setback. How do you measure the front setback of the building that is askew and stepped back. Curb to curb?

Hartronft says the 5 feet is to the furthest projection of the building face. Property line to corner of building.

Public Comment:

Michael Menaker, 1827 W Choke Cherry Drive, Louisville, CO

He wishes to speak about the people bringing this project forward, the history behind it, and the vision from the City that led to it. It has been a longtime goal for this City to preserve the Grain Elevator. It looked like it was an impossible task. There was an attempt led by Eric Hartronft that was not successful but he didn't give up and came back. For those of you who might not know here and at home, Eric Hartronft is the founding father of the historic preservation movement in the City of Louisville. He is an original member of our Historic Preservation Commission. He lives here, his business is here, he is an architect by trade, and an historic preservationist by passion. As I have noted before, the Caranci family name is so imbedded in the history of Louisville that it is literally engraved in stone on the building in which we sit tonight. I don't think anybody else could have done this without these deep connections to Louisville and our history. I can't thank them enough for their perseverance, their dedication, and their passion that makes this project possible. I remember Jean Morgan when we were first doing this, selling key lime pies (and still selling key lime pies) to help raise money for this. The City has dedicated tremendous resources to this. The historic preservation community has worked hard for this. When we were trying to pass the historic preservation tax which is still unique in the country, the fliers we put out door to door had a picture of this structure on it. I support this whole heartedly, I urge you to do the same, and in reference to the concern from the neighbors that at previous meetings expressed some concern about the height, it is ironic that when their homes were built, their neighbors said exactly the same thing. I think overall when you weigh the merits of this design and the balance of the architecture and the aesthetics, this is a project that we will be thrilled to have not only for years but for generations. I urge your enthusiastic and unanimous support.

Jean Morgan, 1131 Spruce Street, Louisville, CO

I would like to compliment the two builders on this. They have done a tremendous job. I think it looks fabulous and I am grateful that we have Eric and Randy on this project. It couldn't have a better team. The key lime pie money will go to buy all the historic pictures we have, have them framed, and hang them in the historic area of the Grain Elevator.

Christine Warembourg Wecker, 115 W Cherry Street, Louisville, CO

She is one of the owners of the ranch on Murphy Hill. I have written something to speak tonight because a lot of times when I speak in this room, I get emotional. As coal miners worked underground in Louisville, there were farmers working above ground. Many times, the same individuals working the mines in the wintertime were the farmers and people helping out the farmers in the summertime. As a member of one of the farm families, I want to express my appreciation, first to Randy and Eric for taking on the project of restoring the elevator, one of the few symbols of farming in this community, and it is not a small task. Also, thank you to the Historical Commission and to you as well for recognizing the importance of educating the community in providing a place for those who have been here for generations and newcomers to connect with our history. My father, Klubert, and his brother, Dutch, purchased the scales located at the elevators so farmers could continue to weigh their grains before taking them to Denver or Greeley after the Elevator closed. We have donated them to the restoration project knowing it is an integral part of the restoration. We also want to donate the small granary that has been at the ranch since our family moved there in 1957. Pete Murphy purchased the land containing the ranch as well as the land the elevator now sits on in 1905. He began to ranch and milk cows immediately upon purchase at our ranch, and built the granary. It is small and has all the requirements of storing grain. There is a window at the peak on the side, ventilation holes to allow for fresh air to keep the grains from spoiling, and there is ventilation underneath which is a very interesting process. There is tongue-and-groove wood inside to prevent the grain from seeping through the walls. It has sat at the same location since we believe around 1910. It is leaning badly, barely missed being destroyed by the flood, but stands proud as a symbol as those who worked so hard to feed us. It is with pride that we donate this to the community that my family has lived in, as of last year, for six generations. I look forward to it being restored and telling the story my family told me and my children for generations about the joy and hardship of farming here.

Sherry Sommer, 910 S. Palisade Court, Louisville, CO

I appreciate this plan and this is first time I have heard about it. It looks like it has a lot of integrity. I appreciate what Eric said about the traffic calming. I don't know if this is your purview or City Council's, but I think it will be really important, especially when they fix the County bridge that comes from a busy area, to make sure people don't shoot through since children are there. I don't know if the hours of operation for outdoor dining are customary or if that's the law in Louisville. I don't live in downtown but I feel for the people who do. You go out to dinner until around 8 or 9 o'clock, and after that, people go out to drink. When they drink, they get loud. There have been problems with this for people living downtown. It should be addressed regarding the hours that people are allowed to go out, and infringe on people's personal time at home.

Debby Fahey, 1118 W Enclave Circle, Louisville CO

I would like to reiterate all of the praise that has been given, first to Randy and Eric. I think they have done a wonderful job. This is a really significant structure for the history of Louisville. As Chris Wecker pointed out, it is the only real visual reminder that we have of the agricultural history of the town. We have a lot of mining history that is documented. This is the first thing has been done agriculturally. I would also like to thank Chris and her family for donating the scales and the little grain shed.

Summary and request by Staff and Applicant:

Russell wants clarification on underground and overhead utilities, and the streetlights. Robinson says the condition from Public Works relating to the overhead utility lines was that overhead utility lines within and adjacent to the site and new developments are required to underground dry utility lines. Specific requirements concerning undergrounding will be included in the subdivision agreement. He recognizes there could be some confusion about that condition and whether they are required to underground utilities off site or the ones on-site. Staff

recommends a condition that the applicant work with Staff and Public Works to clarify the need to underground utilities on-site and that it will be addressed in the subdivision agreement. Russ says this is the first time that Staff has heard of this concern. He requests a condition from Planning Commission that street lights also be clarified. We request to continue the applicant's concern for clarification prior to City Council.

Robinson says regarding outdoor dining, Staff has Lulu's condition. It says "the outdoor patio shall not be used past 12 am on any given day".

Russ asks that the applicant respond to the two additional conditions.

Hartronft says they are happy to work on the street light issue with Staff. They also like the condition that the applicant underground all on-site utilities, not adjacent.

Staff recommends approval of **Grain Elevator Final Plat and PUD and SRU:** (Louisville Mill Site, LLC.) – Resolution No. 14, Series 2015 - A Resolution recommending approval of a final plat, final Planned Unit Development (PUD), and Special Review Use (SRU) to allow for the construction of a new building and additions to two existing buildings totaling 27,000 square feet and allow outdoor sales and activities at the Grain Elevator site, 500-544 County Road, with five conditions:

- 1. The porch at the southwest corner of the Lot 1 building shall be expanded and columns and wood siding elements shall be added with landscaping and trees to further screen the existing building materials.
- 2. The proposed monument sign shall be removed and two freestanding signs shall be allowed, one at each main access drive, with the size, lighting, and detail to comply with the Downtown Sign Manual.
- 3. Use of the outdoor areas shall be limited to between the hours of 8 am and midnight.
- 4. The applicant and City Staff will continue to work to clarify and address requirements related to Public Works comments regarding streetlights on County Road.
- 5. The applicant and City Staff will continue to work to clarify and address requirements related to Public Works comments regarding undergrounding utilities adjacent to property.

Closed Public Hearing and discussion by Commission:

Russell is in support. He thinks it is a great project. It is a project with a tremendous amount of community value being created.

Rice is in support. This is a terrific project. The question of height has been answered by the applicant. This project has tremendous economic potential for the City. It currently generates little and will be a tremendous asset to the City.

O'Connell is in support. The quality of the design and the consideration of the City and the neighborhood surrounding it definitely warrants the waivers on the heights. She is in favor regarding the conditions. As along as the applicant is fine with what Staff suggests, she is in support of the resolution.

Moline is in support. He appreciated hearing people's comments about the project which is a great one. To hear the community come together in their support of the project is symbolic of our city here in Louisville.

Brauneis is in support. He is very excited about the project. He looks forward to it becoming a reality. He is concerned about issues of undergrounding utilities and streetlights.

Pritchard is in support. He thinks it will be a great addition to the community. He understands the applicant's concern regarding underground utilities and streetlights. He has no problem with variances. He is concerned about small parking spaces.

Motion made by Brauneis to approve Resolution No. 14, Series 2015 with five conditions, seconded by Moline. Roll call vote.

Name	Vote
Chris Pritchard	Yes
Jeff Moline	Yes
Ann O'Connell	Yes
Cary Tengler	N/A
Steve Brauneis	Yes
Scott Russell	Yes
Tom Rice	Yes
Motion passed/failed:	Pass

Motion passes 6-0.

➤ DELO Plaza – Resolution of Denial, Resolution No 12, Series 2015 - A Resolution denying a rezoning, final plat, final Planned Unit Development (PUD), and Special Review Use (SRU) for the redevelopment of a 3.9 acre property within the core project area of the of the Highway 42 Revitalization Area. The redevelopment includes the addition of approximately 19,308-23,000 sq. ft. of commercial space.

Staff Report of Facts and Issues:

Troy Russ presents. This is the conclusion of the item heard at the last PC public hearing. Staff does not have a presentation. This is a draft resolution of denial of what Staff heard were the reasons behind the decision the PC made at the previous meeting. Staff requests that PC review it. If there are any edits or modifications to clarify, or if the PC agrees with Staff's interpretation of the reasons of denial, Staff requests approval.

Discussion by Commission:

Rice asks if this is a necessary part of the process and that we state reasons? Russ says yes, and clarification of reasons is necessary.

Rice says he has some concern that the reasons stated in the resolution are not those that he expressed.

Russ says that is why it is in draft form. If Rice feels he has additional comments or concerns, Staff can modify and add conditions since Staff has the minutes.

Rice says that when the PC votes, we don't always have the same reasons to vote in favor or against. To express it in a resolution form and then try to capture all of it, it doesn't necessarily do so. The reasons he was opposed to the project were twofold. He didn't view on balance that the numerous waivers being sought by the project were appropriate. When you took the aggregate of all of the waivers being sought, he thought it was over-reaching. The second reason he was opposed to it (and he expressed during the meeting), was it was his view that Staff and the applicant and the interactive process had not been exhausted before it was presented to the PC. Some of these issues might have been resolved before it was brought to our attention. These are his two principal reasons why he was opposed to the project, and it was not captured in the resolution presently drafted.

O'Connell says when she looks at the reasons for denial, she is comfortable with the wording until Section 3, (a) where the wording states "nor is it designed or oriented toward the pedestrian." She thinks this wording is subjective. She does not know if the wording after "nor" is a viable reason for denial.

Russ says the applicant is provided a schedule, so Staff gave the applicant the option to continue the item, to get on the same page, and the applicant chose not to. The applicant has a right to follow the schedule and come forth. He agrees this item clearly disturbed Comm. Rice, but in terms of criteria, the applicant had every right to advance the hearing to that point.

Rice says he is not casting stones in any particular direction but it felt to him, and the way he phrased it at the hearing, was that it was "half-baked".

Russ says he noted Rice's comments and worked with the minutes to clarify that. He also noted Comm. O'Connell comments. Are there other reasons we need to add to the Resolution of Denial?

Brauneis says he thinks the pedestrian issue is essential. He appreciates that it could be interpreted as subjective but it is an essential element for that piece of property. Russ says that the PC is present and separate from Staff or City Council. It is the duty of PC to interpret the subjective.

O'Connell says her question/response is whether or not being "designed or oriented toward the pedestrian" is included or could be included with being "compatible with the surrounding designs and neighborhoods".

Russ says both could be criteria towards the intent of the Mixed Use Design Standards and Guidelines (MUDDSG). He does not think that specific comment is alien to what a reason of denial would be. The adjacent neighborhoods are not under the same guidelines. There is a compatibility question when looking at adjacencies, which is a criteria to look at. The MUDDSG have a very clear expectation of pedestrian orientation.

O'Connell says that adding "based off the Mixed Use Guidelines", it would be helpful. Russ clarifies the intent of a pedestrian environment.

Russell asks which criteria addresses the fact that it completely and utterly failed to advance the Corridor Plan that we accepted?

Russ says after the "half-baked" portion.

Russell states all the Municipal Code stuff is fine but ultimately to him, that was the reason he rejected it. The Design Guidelines are important. The Corridor Plan matters. We invested in it, we have it there for a reason, and it expresses a vision. The applicant didn't live up to it for no good reason other than commercial purposes. He thinks it should be stated that it failed to advance in any material way the vision articulated in the Highway 42 Revitalization Plan.

O'Connell agrees to tie it to the specific document, and that it failed to meet it. Russ says there are two: a policy document which is not referenced as the Highway 42 Revitalization Plan and the specific zoning which is the MUDDSG. If this is an item to be included, Staff will clarify it and advance it to City Council.

Pritchard says it should be added. It makes it more concrete as to what PC was looking at and where it was failing. He sees in Section 3, it hits those reasons.

Russell says Staff can take the "completely and utterly" words out, but it should be stated very clearly that it failed to advance or did not meet the intent of the Highway 42 Plan.

Motion made by Russell to approve **DELO Plaza – Resolution of Denial, Resolution No 12, Series 2015**, with clarifications from Staff, seconded by Moline. Roll call vote.

Name	Vote
Chris Pritchard	Yes
Jeff Moline	Yes
Ann O'Connell	Yes
Cary Tengler	N/A
Steve Brauneis	Yes

Scott Russell	Yes
Tom Rice	Yes, with clarifications
Motion passed/failed:	Pass

Motion passes 6-0.

➤ Live/Work Ordinance–CC zone district, Resolution No. 13, Series 2015, A
Resolution recommending City Council approval of an ordinance amending Title 17 of
the Louisville Municipal Code to define Live-Work uses and allow their development in
the community commercial and mixed use zone districts throughout Louisville.

Public Notice Certification:

This is a legislative action, so only public notice was posting the agenda of this item. The actual public notice of any ordinance comes through the first reading of the ordinance done by the City Clerk. The agenda was posted in City Hall, Public Library, Recreation Center, and the Courts and Police Building on April 3, 2015.

Staff Report of Facts and Issues:

Russ presented from Power Point:

- The proposed definition is Live-Work means a single property with one or more structures that combine a commercial activity allowed by-right in the underlying zone district with a single residential living unit.
- It is a common Planning term. Every historic community has Live-Work environments. Examples in Louisville are 801 Main Street which was a Post Office and residence (moved to 721 Grant Avenue). The City Hall parcel had a barber with a dwelling unit. The Blue Parrot parcel had a drug store with a dwelling unit behind it. A current example is 901 Main Street which is an office commercial building with an attached single family dwelling.
- In 1967 when Louisville implemented the Zoning Code, it was made an illegal activity in the City.
- How do we create a Mixed Use environment? Live-Work is somewhat Mixed Use. It is supposed to be one residential unit and one commercial unit. There is home occupation allowed in all residential units. If you live in a house, you are allowed to conduct business. Home occupations are for small scale, non-disruptive commercial activities within neighborhoods.
- In Community Commercial Zone Districts, there is a commercial component allowed by right. The residential component is only multi-family as an option, not single family, and is allowed by Special Review.
- In Mixed Use Zone District, commercial allowed by right. Residential, multi-family allowed by right in MU-R, but not allowed in CC. Single family dwelling is not allowed in either.
- The draft ordinance before the PC and will go before City Council says the Commercial Community (CC) and Mixed Use (MU) Zone Districts will be the only two districts in the City where Life-Work would be allowed.
- Performance standards.
 - The commercial and residential portions of the live-work use shall remain under single ownership and shall not be subdivided.
 - The residential portion of the Live-Work use shall not exceed sixty six percent (66%) of the total floor area of the development.
 - The residential portion of the Live-Work use is prohibited in the lower level of the building facing the front lot line of the parcel.
 - Parking requirements for a Live-Work use shall be as follows:

- The commercial portion of the development shall provide a parking space for every 500sf of the floor area rounded to nearest 500 sf.
- The residential portion of the development shall adhere to the following:
 - 1-bdrm unit min: 1 space per unit; max: 1.25 spaces per unit
 - 2-bdrm unit min: 2 spaces per unit
 - 3-or-more-bedroom unit min: 2 spaces per unit
- A parking requirement waiver may be requested when a demonstrated shared parking analysis is provided.
- The parking requirement is waived for Louisville Landmarked structures with approved alteration certificate.
- o Commercial Community (CC) zone district shall comply with:
 - Outside of Downtown Commercial Development Design Standards and Guidelines (CDDSG).
 - In Downtown The Downtown Handbook

Staff Recommendations:

Resolution No. 13, Series 2015, recommending City Council approval of an ordinance amending the Louisville Municipal Code (LMC) to define Live-Work uses and allow their development in the Community Commercial and Mixed Use Zone Districts throughout Louisville with two conditions.

- 1. The draft ordinance shall be modified to allow Live-Work in the area defined as Downtown Louisville and the Mixed Use Zone District.
- 2. The draft ordinance shall be modified to add a note in the parking requirements stating "the parking requirement is waived for Louisville Landmarked structures incorporating Live-Work."

Commission Questions of Staff:

O'Connell makes motion to enter emails from Peter Stewart, Thursday, April 9, 2015, and revised Resolution No. 13, seconded by Brauneis, voice vote, passes.

Rice asks from a property tax standpoint, using commercial property both in a commercial and a residential style, how does that affect the classification for purposes of property tax? Russ says he doesn't know, but he would refer that to the City Finance Director. The Finance Director was referred this project and he felt comfortable with the ordinance that he could implement it.

Russell asks if there is an expectation that requires there be a connection between who is living there and who is working there?

Russ says there is not in this ordinance. In theory, the intent is the shop-owner lives and works in the same site. In reality, that may not happen. There is a condition that it shall not subdivide. A number of scenarios could be owner on site, rents out commercial, or rents out residential and works on site, or rent out both. Only one owner.

Russell asks what is the ordinance trying to accomplish?

Russ says it gives a tremendous economic value to the smaller lots of Downtown. On long narrow lots, you can retain a smaller scale investment and give economic value. There is a strong demand for single family. It is lower demand on the school district than multi-family. It gives the economic value of residential but commercial remains. Downtown's unique commercial storefronts, being the scale they are, will be able to get incentives for preservation.

Planning Commission
Meeting Minutes
April 9, 2015
Page 12 of 27

Moline asks if this could dilute the amount of commercial Downtown? How would the Planning Department track the viability of the commercial of one of these properties? Russ says the Finance Department of the City and the City Manager's office track the performance of sales and properties taxes. There are aggregate summaries and individual summaries of tax performance. In terms of economic diluting, in terms of upper floors and back portion of a site, the street front in this ordinance can be retail or office. The front and most vibrant part of the building is saved for commercial activities. Staff does not feel the upper floors are viable for retail.

Brauneis asks from a water savings perspective typically, the closer the feedback loop to the occupant, the better the water savings. If people living a space know how much water they've used the previous month or over the course of a year, there will be more water savings rather than hidden within one bill to a landlord. A way to minimize the fees associated with it is probably what is driving a lot of the concern. Separate meters for two very different occupant types are more appropriate.

Russ says Staff will bring this concern up as the ordinance is still being drafted and reviewed by the Finance Director and the Public Works Director. The intent of this is the owner is the same person seeing the bill. The reality is we can't discriminate that aspect in Chapter 17 of who rents and who owns. Can we make sure that the tenants of the buildings somehow receive the bill? Staff will work with it while still lowering the fees. The commercial rates are based on water usage. They believe office use is comparable to a residential use. The rate may not be different on this scale of investment. If a restaurant were to go in, they would be very different commercial rates because they are scalable on the commercial side, but not the residential side. We want to protect the City's water supply by making sure we charge a commercial rate.

Moline asks about the maximum parking requirement for the one-bedroom unit? 1.25 spaces? Russ says one space is maximum. Staff is trying to put a parking maximum in Downtown because we don't want to see parking in a pedestrian-oriented environment. For this particular ordinance, he recommends deleting the 1.25 space because it is "odd" for a one bedroom. This was copied out of the Downtown Code where single units are illegal. Staff recommends 2 spaces because most residents have two cars.

Russell asks about parking. He wants maximum parking limits. The expectation is that the one bedroom needs one space and the two bedroom needs two spaces. This is on-site parking that will be addressed through a shared parking agreement, shared parking between the commercial and residential unit.

Russ says Staff is allowing them to be reduced in a shared parking environment. One space for 500 feet of commercial development. In commercial, there is a 998 square foot waiver for the first 1,000 square feet. If it is a 2,000 square foot building, they would owe two parking spaces. They would also owe the residential parking. If they demonstrate a shared parking agreement, that would give Staff assurance that if the owner of the shop is actually there, Staff would reduce the parking requirement accordingly.

Russell asks about the residential portion, when there is tight parking, high turnover really helps. He asks if introducing the Live-Work raises the likelihood that someone will park a car and leave it there. There are some streets where you can't do that. He doesn't know about side streets and residential streets. Setting a maximum for a site only allows a certain amount of parking, so other options will be sought. Are we creating a problem where there isn't adequate parking onsite and people try to find other accommodations for their vehicle in Old Town? Can we mitigate that?

Russ says these are the parking standards of Downtown. We are not creating anything different.

Russell asks will we accept fee in lieu for parking?

Russ says that is a Downtown ordinance. This particular use does not provide that option.

Public Comment:

Debby Fahey, 1118 W Enclave Circle, Louisville, CO

She likes the idea of a residential-commercial combination on Main Street with a single family unit. Her concern is someone buying two or three adjoining businesses, combining them into one large single front, and then building a unit behind it. When giving the approval for zoning, can there be a tie where the owner has to maintain at least the minimum amount of retail square footage that existed in the old building? She is concerned that new buildings will be built and that old shops will be torn down. Perhaps this can be an incentive for landmarking; if you landmark, you can put a single family unit on the back.

Andy Johnson, 920 Lincoln Avenue, Louisville, CO

He is in support of this ordinance. He thinks this is a self-correction from modern zoning and separation of uses across our town and landscape. This is a use type that is no stranger to towns across the United States, and certainly not to the heritage of Louisville. Troy Russ demonstrated this with a few site plans taken from very old maps. He supports the inclusion of the MU district. While there are certain parts of Louisville that are designated MU, he thinks some of the newer parts are intriguing to keep as a consideration. One of the most important things this ordinance does in bringing Live-Work back to Louisville is that it offers a diversification of building types within our Downtown. He thinks the way it is written is very well done. It promotes and encourages the landmarking of existing building, which is very important, particularly for our iconic Main Street. It also protects our Main Street from future development in that we will probably not see another three story building on our Main Street. The viability economically is retail, restaurants, and offices to some degree. The scale of what happens on Main Street is somewhat protected by having the use be defined as commercial on Main Street and residential in back. He thinks this is a really important distinction worth of further thought and consideration. When you are thinking about the implication architecturally on Main Street, he thinks the scale of buildings will remain low. Also with a Live-Work model, there typically is a diversification within the sites so the commercial buildings will have a certain look. The residential building is probably going to be something different. He thinks it offers a unique character, both to Main Street, Front Street, and our alleys as well. The parking is obviously an important consideration. The waiver for landmarked buildings is very important. It is a great bone to throw at commercial building owners. It is also a great bone to throw at people who buy a commercial building and consider redevelopment. Parking is expensive to buy. Parking obviously takes up a lot of real estate and takes away from the economic vitality of smaller properties around Old Town. He does have a specific concern that he doesn't think the PC can address but it does come out of the Municipal Code. It is Chapter 13 which deals with water. With a Live-Work project, he thinks it is important to allow a single owner to have a single tap and a single bill. If you have the same owner paying the water bill, it can be structured for the ease of billing from the City's perspective. The issue can be remedied by having a single bill, look at it as a commercial water tap, and do it based on demand. He knows the PC won't address it, but he does want it part of public record to be read at a later date. This is something that will correct moderate planning for Downtown. He thanks Planning for bringing it to the table.

Sherry Sommer, 910 S Palisade Court, Louisville, CO

She has a question more than a comment. Will this change the footprint of buildings and the height of buildings? Will it remain about the same? If it does, she is concerned the Downtown area would feel very dense if it allows larger footprints.

Russ says there is nothing in the ordinance that modifies the yard bulk standards. The floor area allowances would be unchanged from what is currently allowed. This simply gives another economic opportunity for investment and he believes it is a strategy for smaller parcels to retain

commercial structures up front. It would not change heights. It would allow a lower density than is currently allowed to be considered. Currently, multi-family is allowed to be considered and single family is not allowed to be considered as part of the Downtown Zoning District. He does not believe it will change the intensity of Downtown. The effect will actually change the difference. It will give economic opportunity for lower density to have viable uses. Staff knows that what is done to Chapter 17 will affect Chapter 13. Staff does not believe this affects this particular issue in Chapter 16, but Staff is aware of Chapter 13. Draft ordinances have been sent to the Finance Director who runs utility billing as well as Water Engineer and Public Works Director modifying some of the water ordinances that require separate distinct taps. Under one owner such as a shopping center with multiple tenants, the Code reads every premise needs a separate connection. There is no ordinance for Live-Work. The Finance Director has reviewed it from a public utility billing perspective and is comfortable requiring only one tap to serve a building. The Water and Resource Engineer as well as the City's Public Works Director both feel comfortable that this would not impact water supply. There is consensus among all of them that the water rates would be charged at a commercial rate, not residential rate. These types of ordinances will be married under City Council.

Camilla W. Donnelly, 2366 Senator Court, Louisville, CO

She may be confused but the Downtown has grown in a nice way over the last 10-12 years. She wonders if we might have more control if people have to "ask" to do things, rather than start tweaking with it. Perhaps she is misunderstanding things but we are suddenly trying to do Work-Family rather than focusing on the commercial. She looks at Bittersweet and how they moved back with a lot of commercial things that bring people from outside. This is where we get our tax dollars. She thinks most people don't work in Louisville, but work outside. It seems like a strange thing to start doing now.

Barney Funk, 1104 Hillside Lane, Louisville, CO

He thinks this is an excellent idea. There is a town in western PA called Ligonier, PA. It has Work-Live standards in its town. In the center of town, there is a Main Street coming in north-south, and a street running east-west, and they have Live-Work homes on the Main Streets and the sub-streets leading in. It has created Work-Life home environments where the owner of the property and the resident of the Live part own a piano store giving lessons, an antique store, a gift store, and a florist. There are little stores east and west, north and south, and it brings in a lot of additional sales tax to the community. It brings in a home environment. He didn't think Louisville was thinking about it, but he compliments you. To do any research, the zip code is 15658, Ligonier, PA. It is 60 miles east of Pittsburgh. They have this and it is working very well.

Laurie Bija, 3169 Oak Circle North, Broomfield, CO

She is attending for a school assignment. She highly supports this. It supports a reduction of sprawl for people coming into Louisville and causing more traffic and commotion. If they can live where they are actually employed, it is very awesome. Well done, Louisville.

Closed Public Hearing and discussion by Commission:

Brauneis is in support of Live-Work. With the advent of smart homes and monitoring different things, the water issue has the potential to provide the capability for people in these units to have information come to them. At a minimum, if we can't cost effectively require separate meters for two very different uses, we can require from a plumbing perspective that the two different areas within a building can be sub-metered, not within the City purview but outside of City purview, so the pipes are in place. Long term, we talk about Louisville having plenty of water but when we're in a 10 year drought seen elsewhere in the country, it becomes a real issue. With the growth of electronic smart homes, this is something to be made available with minimal cost at this time. He thinks Live-Work makes a lot of sense. The question was raised about why we want to tinker with this now? Actually, it goes back to 1967 when we tinkered

Planning Commission
Meeting Minutes
April 9, 2015
Page 15 of 27

with it. While organically we have a nice feel to Downtown, this change doesn't threaten that organic feel, but rather it supports continued occupancy following those traditional patterns. As far as the other areas Mr. Stewart raised in his email, he doesn't have as much of an issue with it as he does. He is comfortable moving forward as it have been written and not working to limit only to our historic Downtown area. If builders and developers were to approach the PC with projects in those other areas on South Boulder Road and McCaslin, if we feel as a City it doesn't work well there, we would find ways to deal with it at the time. He is not convinced we need to exclude South Boulder Road and McCaslin from this. He is excited by it.

Moline is in support. He can foresee this playing out project by project basis because we have had some projects in Downtown apply to this issue. He has trouble visualizing how it will play out across Downtown. It makes him agree with Mr. Stewart's comment and think that trying it in Downtown is a good starting place to see how it works. It is an interesting concept and excited to give it a shot. He is comfortable with parking.

O'Connell is in support. She thanks Commissioner Brauneis for thinking long term. She is in favor with the way it is written and no issue with the parking.

Rice wants the property tax issue resolved before he votes on it because to him, it is a significant issue. He understands the intent of the ordinance which is, conceptually, to foster a Live-Work environment for people. If someone has a commercial property and is living on-site, this is the historical context alluded to in introducing the measure. He has a real question about whether it will really play out. Instead, what will happen is this will be an opportunity for a commercial property owner to add that residential component. He is fully cognizant of the reasons of why you wouldn't want to be involved in an enforcement situation where you would have to link the two. In fact, he doesn't know if you can do that. In terms of the practical side, believing that this will foster a lot of people to own commercial real estate Downtown and then live there on-site, he has real reservations about whether that would happen in reality. That reservation is less important to him than the property tax issue. He is concerned about that and knows the ramifications of that before he votes.

Russell is in support and he likes this policy. He thinks we will be refining and correcting it as it progresses. There could be some unintended consequences. He is not worried about the disconnected use of the residential. Anything that creates value for owners in a way that is compatible with community expectations is great. Anything that adds a residential population to Downtown recognizing that any number of these new residents will come to us and complain about patios that were there when they moved in, that is fine and part of life in Downtown. He thinks it is a great program.

Pritchard asks the fellow Commissioners in regard to Comm. Rice's comments, do you feel comfortable enough that this matter can be voted on this evening or do you feel the issue on property taxes needs to be addressed further before you could feel comfortable. He believes Comm. Rice has a valid point for clarification.

Brauneis appreciates Comm. Rice raising the point. It is good to have it as part of the conversation. He is not convinced at this point that it will make or break his vote on the proposal. He is comfortable believing that it is not hugely significant from a revenue standpoint for the City.

Moline is agreement with Comm. Brauneis. He thinks it is an important consideration, but he is comfortable moving it on and letting City Council address it with any additional information they may have at their hearing.

O'Connell comfortable moving forward. Russell comfortable moving forward. Pritchard says that he wants Comm. Rice's concerns are noted to City Council and an answer is prepared for him.

Russ says that this is one of many potential dynamos of any single ordinance much like the water ordinance. Chapter 3 in the Municipal Code governs revenue and finance of the City and that is why it was referred to the Finance Director. If there are necessary modifications to clarify property taxes and how they work, that would be an ordinance brought forward to City Council. Planning Commission does not have jurisdiction. Russ can pass PC concern on to the Finance Director, but he assures Comm. Rice that the Finance Director has reviewed this ordinance.

Rice clarifies that the Finance Director's answer that there was "zero" fiscal impact. What was the answer? What is the need to move forward now as opposed to in a month? Is this something that has time sensitivity to it?

Russ states there was no net change and no significant impact to the fiscal resources to the City. There is some private interest to it from a City perspective, so we want to get it right. If there are concerns that you think affect Chapter 17 in the LMC, I would recommend you wait. Chapter 3 is the Finance and Revenue section of the City and it is under the City Council subcommittee called the Finance Committee that reviews all recommended ordinances that impact that portion of the City. We can delay this if it is important to you.

Rice clarifies that the PC is voting on land use under Chapter 17 and not anything having to do with fiscal impact. Why is fiscal impact part of our discussion when it has nothing to do with what PC is considering?

Russ says the City Manager has directed that whenever there is communication affecting the Municipal Code or change in zoning or amendment to the Comp Plan, Staff must document for information purposes. It is continued to City Council who has a direct job in assessing it.

Motion made by Brauneis to approve Resolution No. 13, Series 2015, seconded by O'Connell. Roll call vote.

Name	Vote
Chris Pritchard	Yes
Jeff Moline	Yes
Ann O'Connell	Yes
Cary Tengler	N/A
Steve Brauneis	Yes
Scott Russell	Yes
Tom Rice	Yes with reservations passed to City Council
Motion passed/failed:	Pass

Motion passes 6-0.

Meeting paused for break at 8:45, resumed at 8:55 pm.

Russ asks Chairman Pritchard to ask for a show of hands from the audience regarding their intention to speak on the Small Area Plan – McCaslin and the Small Area Plan – South Boulder Road. Pritchard states that the PC will not entertain any additional topics at 10 pm. The Small Area Plan – McCaslin will be discussed first and the Small Area Plan - South Boulder Road may not be addressed. Pritchard asks the PC if an overflow meeting is possible on April 23, 2015,

which will be a continuation of the current meeting. Russ states that all interested parties who have submitted their emails will be contacted.

Small Area Plan – McCaslin (Measures of Success)

Staff Report of Facts and Issues:

Scott Robinson presented from Power Point:

- Study area extends from US 36 to Via Appia, properties adjacent to McCaslin on the east and all Centennial Valley on the west.
- Purpose is to define the desired land uses for the corridor, establish preferred physical character with design guidelines, and outline public infrastructure priorities.
- · Process included five phases.
 - Phase 1 Desire: Set goals
 - Phase 2 Discovery: Corridor analysis
 - Phase 3 Design: Develop alternatives
 - Phase 4 Discussion: Select preferred alternative
 - Phase 5 Documentation: Codify results
- Phase 1 Desire
 - Opportunities/Constraints analysis
 - Project measures of success
- Community Input
 - ULI (Urban Land Institute) Technical Advisory Panel. Interviewed stakeholders in the corridor, property owners and developers, business owners, and residents in and near the corridor. Results and their analysis as form of input.
 - o www.EnvisionLouisvilleCO.com. Questions submitted with responses.
 - o Public kick-off meeting in February with good attendance.
- ULI TAP results
 - Make retail more attractive
 - Provide better connections for cars and pedestrians
 - Capitalize on nearby transportation investments on US 36, new interchange, new lanes, and new bus service
 - Create corridor identity
 - Outdated regulations
- EnvisionLouisvilleCO website, general comments
 - o Better sense of place
 - Civic gathering area and parks
 - o Better design of buildings, signs, and public art
 - Land use mix should create activity and meet City fiscal goals
 - Better connections to and through the corridor
 - Connection to heritage is lacking
- Kick-off Meeting in February 2015
 - Dot exercise
 - Green dots for likes-vacant parcels, open space, specific businesses
 - Red dots for dislikes Sam's Club, McCaslin itself and intersections.
 - Blue dots for immediate change Sam's Club
 - Small group discussions how it is used, like to use it, felt core community values defined in the Comp Plan are applied
 - Desire for better connectivity
 - More public amenities
 - Area lacking distinctive Louisville character
 - Not well integrated into the rest of the City
 - Ensure economic vibrancy and sustainability
- Opportunities/Constraints

Opportunities	Constraints
 Traffic providing potential customers for businesses Investments at interchange and BRT station Significant park/open space amenities just outside the corridor Several areas ready for investment Significant landscaping along the corridor Potential for identity-defining features 	 Disconnected parcels Traffic making the corridor unpleasant for visitors Lack of visibility for businesses Limited bike and pedestrian connectivity Lack of public gathering spaces in the corridor Outdated site and building designs and development and zoning regulations Visitors unaware of connections to the rest of Louisville Market capture area limited by street network, regional competition, and open space

- Community Values Identified. The McCaslin Blvd study area is lacking:
 - A sense of community
 - o Sustainable practices for the economy, community, and environment
 - Unique commercial areas and distinctive neighborhoods

Measures of Success

- **Principle 1** Improve connectivity and accessibility while accommodating regional transportation needs.
 - Increase the network connectivity of roads parallel to McCaslin Blvd
 - Are vehicles able to move between parcels without returning to McCaslin Blvd?
 - Make sure traffic passing through the corridor does not make it an undesirable place to live, work, play, and travel
 - Does traffic noise decrease?
 - Do pedestrians and bicyclists feel safe?
 - How long will a trip take on the corridor?
- Accommodate future regional transportation plans
 - How does the corridor alternative adequately address future transportation needs?
 - How does the corridor alternative accommodate adopted regional transit plans?
- Provide wayfinding to locations within and outside the corridor
 - Are visitors able to find key destinations and locations in the study area?
 - Are visitors able to find connections to key destination outside the study area, such as Downtown?
- **Principle 2** Create public and private gathering spaces to meet the needs of residents, employees, and visitors.
 - o Provide for community amenities identified in the survey and elsewhere
 - o Provide a central civic space to help create a sense of place
 - Encourage, through design guidelines or incentives, private developers to incorporate publicly accessible spaces into new developments

- Identify which, if any, undeveloped parcels should be purchased for park/open space
 - Does the ratio of acres to users meet City standards?
 - Do public spaces connect to form a cohesive network?
- Provide programming to activate public spaces
- Principle 3 Enhance bicycle and pedestrian connections to private and public uses.
 - Provide safe and convenient facilities that serve a broad range of users with multiple modes of travel
 - Are all modes of travel accommodated?
 - Are users of all ages and ability levels accommodated?
 - Do the improvements proposed provide safer conditions for all users and ability levels?
 - Are existing deficiencies addressed?
 - Do bike and pedestrian facilities connect to trip beginning and end points?
 - o Design solutions that the City can realistically maintain over time
 - o Promote regional trail connectivity within the study area
 - Is a connection provided through the study area to Davidson Mesa and the new underpass under US 36 at Davidson Mesa?
- **Principle 4** Utilize policy and design to encourage desired uses to locate in the corridor and to facilitate the reuse or redevelopment of vacant buildings.
 - o Do allowed uses serve community needs as defined in survey and elsewhere?
 - o Are allowed uses supported by the market?
 - To what extent are incentives and/or public infrastructure partnerships needed to induce identified uses to locate in the study area?
 - To what extent do uses capitalize on investments at the US 36 interchange and Bus Rapid Transit station?
 - o Does the land use mix demonstrate strong fiscal benefits?
 - Is the process for approving desired uses and desired character simpler and more predictable?
- **Principle 5** Establish design regulations to ensure development closely reflects the community's vision for the corridor while accommodating creativity in design.
 - Physical form should incorporate desires expressed in the community survey and elsewhere
 - Ensure signage and landscape regulations allow for adequate business visibility without detracting from aesthetic qualities of the corridor
 - Does signage clearly direct visitors to businesses without appearing overbearing or too cluttered?
 - Does landscaping provide for a pleasant visitor experience while still providing visibility to businesses?
 - Allow flexibility to respond to changes in market requirements, design trends, and creativity in design
- Tentative Schedule
 - April 9 Planning Commission Review
 - May 5 City Council endorsement
 - o June Walkability Audit and Placemaking Workshop
 - Summer Public meeting #3 develop alternatives

Commission Questions of Staff:

No questions from Commissioners.

Two emails entered into record, motion made by Brauneis, seconded by Moline.

Public Comment:

Brian Larson, 730 Copper Lane, #205, Louisville, CO

He thanks the Planning Department for the work put into the Workshop for the McCaslin corridor. It had a great degree of input that was considered and greatly appreciates the chance of a democratic process and some decision-making. He would like the PC to focus especially on Principles 1 and 3, the issues of trans-connectivity and integration into larger transit network as well the integration of a broad range of users. Currently, the problem with the McCaslin corridor is that it is automobile dependent. I am not one of those people. We have one car in our household and my wife uses that vehicle. I get to my work by public transportation which is the Park & Ride. I am one mile from the Park & Ride Station and that is as close as you can live residentially to that location. For most transit accessibility, it is recommended to be within onequarter mile and I am about 4X that distance. I think one of the things we should look at in future use of the corridor is providing greater opportunity for individuals to live a little bit closer to the transit network that will be accessible to them, especially the Bus Rapid Transit. He wants to minimize the distance that individuals walk to that location in a pedestrian friendly environment. The split lanes along McCaslin and Dillon can lead to many cars not yielding to a pedestrian when you try to cross and often times, you almost get hit. It does not effectively condone a broad range of users and transit accessibility.

Barney Funk, 1104 Hillside Lane, Louisville, CO

He wants to ask the PC that as you do your planning process, and he will participate as a resident of Louisville, that we give a lot of consideration regarding whatever expansion project is how it will potentially strain the school district. We have seen this happen at Louisville Elementary (LES) and Louisville Middle School (LMS). I would not like to see it happen on the other side of town at Coal Creek Elementary, Fireside Elementary, or Monarch K-8, if we have greater capacity residential areas. I live in Centennial Valley West and at one point when we were thinking about the five year plan three years ago. There was discussion of putting in a minimum of 120 patio homes on some land between Centennial and Infinity, and then went up to Davidson Mesa. These patio homes were going to take up 90% of the property. Where I live, the development is all 4-bedroom, 3,000 square foot homes in a neighborhood adjacent to the open property. The patio homes would not be a continuation of the design or flavor of our community. It would go from a big 4-bedroom development to a small patio home. I have nothing against patio homes. You can take the 4-bedrooms, go down to 3-bedroom, and then go down to 2-bedroom. It would be a scale down. Even at that, I think it might be a strain on the school district. I was not present at the open meeting, but there was someone who mentioned that private property from my development on Centennial back to Infinity could perhaps be acquired by the City of Louisville as open space. A bike path and another method to get up to Davidson Mesa from the back could be built. I ask for a little consideration on the strain on the school district and then the movement from structures of housing to be consistent with our housing development.

Michael Menaker, 1827 W Choke Cherry Drive, Louisville, CO

I think there are some key issues that need to be resolved with this. It is not clear in my mind how the process we are undertaking is going to get us to any of those answers. The first is what are we going to do with Sam's Club? We are stalled and it's empty for six years. Our attempts at using the power of urban renewal to condemn covenants have stalled out. This is one key question and I don't know how we are going to answer it with this process. Following along that line, what are we going to do when Lowe's and Home Depot inevitably close? All large big box formats die eventually, whether it is showrooms or home stores. It seems to be inevitable that, in the long term scope, we must have some plan as to what comes next. That is why we are stuck with Sam's Club because we have no plan. I think that one of the key questions, and the gentleman before me addressed it, is will we allow any housing whatsoever in Centennial Valley and if we do, what form will it take? I have been a proponent for senior housing and 55+ housing; something like a Steel Ranch Development that would transition to somewhat higher

density to leverage the BRT. That is certainly not the only vision. The first question is are we or are we not going allow any housing? Then the secondary question is what is that going to look like? What concerns me most about this is we are having the conversation without context. We have no discussion of population or demographic trends and what that means. We have not considered the impact of Superior Town Center and the diverging diamond interchange (DDI). We have not looked at any regional issues with our sister towns of Lafayette, Longmont, and Erie. It seems to be that while the process is well intentioned, it lacks a sharp focus. I hope you can help us all by figuring out a way we can develop real answers that can impact the community.

Sid Vinall, 544 Leader Circle, Louisville, CO

He is here mainly to speak about the South Boulder Road Small Area Plan. Since that has been postponed, I will say a few words about McCaslin. In some of the workshops and information gathered about McCaslin, there is a sense of community and more integration with Louisville itself and trying to build up more character in this area. I can't envision that happening. We have a beautiful Downtown right now. McCaslin seems to be a different character. It is mostly commercial in the area. I would love to be able to go to a Target on McCaslin or Office Max or a Costco instead of driving over the bridge and giving my money to Superior. The other night at the City Council meeting, John Leary mentioned that "that" part of the city provides close to 50% of sales tax. It seems to be that in other towns such as Boulder, they have a beautiful Downtown section in the Pearl Street Area with some mixed use and the brick area with a lot of restaurants. They have University Hill. Boulder has 28th Street where the commercial stores are located. I imagine that's where most of their sales tax is coming from. After listening and seeing some of the results of the Workshop, I wonder if McCaslin needs to be our industrial engine. I can understand parks and some plazas, but it seems to me that this part of town may provide more potential for tax revenue for the rest of the town. I know there are going to be more meetings on this whole topic, but those are the thoughts that came to me tonight as Planning Staff presented their findings. I am not sure what the "Four Pillars" are over on McCaslin sticking straight up out of the ground, but I hope in the future they mean something about making a lot more money.

Sherry Sommer, 910 S Palisade Court, Louisville, CO

I am thankful that you are working through this and not just paving it over with a lot of residential or a lot of big boxes. People live there and I enjoy it as it is. I think it could become better. I thank you for thinking about all of these different issues. A couple things I'd like to add. We talked about pedestrian safety. I was walking along Cherry Street today and thinking, it would be great to have traffic calming along Cherry, along Dahlia, and some of these streets touching residential neighborhoods. That's my side of town. I'm sure other people have traffic calming concerns as well. Thank you for considering purchasing open space as I think it is super important for the health of our community. I was just reading an article in the Wall Street Journal about how cities of Boston, San Francisco, and Chicago make little parks and little green spaces where pollinators would want to come. Not such a desert of pavement and junipers. It is a little nature interjected into the Cityscape. I think it is worth considering. I think you should try to buy Open Space as it would create more greenery. I have a question. How much do you work with the Sustainability Board or the Cultural Council? I think it is important to work with all of these different entities in the City and I would like to know how you work with them.

Cindy Bedell, 662 W Willow Street, Louisville, CO

I appreciate the opportunity for public input because these Small Area Plans are incredibly important for all residents of Louisville. I have a couple comments to add. From last year and what I've seen in the paper, our sales tax already went up about 8%. I'm not sure but I heard that there may be some revenue sharing with Superior with the Superior Town Center. I would

like us to keep that in mind. We are already adding at least 1,800 new units so if you figure 2.5 individuals per unit, it is almost 2700 to 3000 people. As we look at this corridor, I would like us to keep this information in mind and not rush to high density, multi-use residential, and especially not put high density residential into the Sam's Club area. I attended the Urban Land Institute presentation and what I heard sounded pretty extreme. I understand it hasn't been well received, but I do hope that we won't go too much toward visibility and too much focus on economics, and give up our quality of life. I have lived in Louisville for 18 years, and the reason it has been the #1 small city is because it is attractive. I didn't choose to live in an Arvada or Broomfield or downtown Denver; I chose to live here. When you drive down McCaslin, you see nice setbacks and nice landscaping. I would hate to see those setbacks taken all the way to the sidewalk and giant signs put in. Many of my neighbors have said that as well. I was happy to see the parks and open space acquisition reflected as a priority in the draft of Measures of Success. I attended the workshop here and heard that mentioned many times by many citizens. In summary, I hope you will consider our quality of life and not just the economics as we look at the McCaslin area.

Debby Fahey, 1118 W Enclave Circle, Louisville, CO

I want to say that the McCaslin corridor has historically been a good revenue generator for the City. I think part of the issue that we are having with this with businesses that are closing is that a lot of those businesses, unlike the Downtown area, are owned by absentee landlords. They are not here to see what would make their business better. I would suggest that perhaps it would be helpful to have a special meeting to gather information from the people who are actually running the businesses rather than the ones who own the buildings.

Linda Boyd, 1148 W Dillon Road, Louisville, CO.

I own a business on McCaslin Blvd and have owned one for 11 years. I made a choice to come and open my business in Louisville because I love the flavor of the town of Louisville. My business is a franchise but when I went to open my franchise, I didn't choose to open it in Denver or Arvada or Westminster. I wanted to come here to Louisville. I see Louisville working hard for big businesses and for the residents, but I do feel they often lose sight of the small and medium-sized businesses. We are served best, and we are able to serve best, when there is a sense of community that involves everybody. I hope I don't go against the law. When I run my business, I am there a lot. I don't think I live and work here, but I have spent the night. My business is located in Colony Square and is part of the McCaslin corridor. I think the community is quick is dismiss the McCaslin corridor as something outside the community. I'd love to see managed traffic speeds, walkable sidewalks, safer intersections, easier access for businesses all around McCaslin. I work and drive it every single day. I go to lunch there, I go to my business, and I also support the South Boulder Road and the Downtown area. I believe in Louisville and I really think this is a great community to have a business and live in. Another thing I wanted to comment about is signage. Signage can be done wrong and it can easily be an eyesore to a community. Signage done well can help us all grow and help us know each other and the events going on. I remember a show of hands at the last meeting. By far away, everybody heard about the meeting by a sign on the road. It wasn't social media and it wasn't all the other things, it was a sign on the road. Good signage is really important to business and things like this. I really am a supporter of the success that has been enjoyed by Downtown Louisville and South Boulder Road area. I think there is room for the McCaslin corridor to join in that success too. I totally want to support that. I think Debbie made a good point about having the business owners come and having a special meeting. I have tried to get some of the other owners to attend. We are all really busy. The restaurants out there are booming. The ones that are small are doing really well. I think you need to hear what the business people are saying about the McCaslin corridor.

I have lived here pretty close to 30 years. I own a home in the Downtown area of Louisville as well. I really applaud what is happening in that area, particularly near my older home on Roosevelt when the Community Park went in. I think some of you remember the old field. I remember it being made into a beautiful Community Park where the Pavilion is now. Now I live on the other side of McCaslin and I think we can make the same thing happen over there. I'd like to see that happen. I'd like to see a concerted plan to make what has happened around my home in the downtown area happen in what I'll call the Uptown area. When I was on the Fire Department, we had the Downtown Fire station and we have the Uptown Fire station. I still remember that. I think we can have that same sort of atmosphere in the Uptown area. I see the bicycle races that go on in the Uptown area and I think that's a way of creating community. We have different ways of connecting to the City, those that live in the newer section of town with those that live in the Downtown section. The other thing I would like to say a word or two about is I was at the first workshop meeting and applauded a lot of the comments that went on about the hot spots and the green spots. We have some major areas of concern and we need to do something with the Sam's Club area because it is a major blight. We also need to think about all that green space that we currently have out there just on the other side of the street from me. What is going to happen to that in the future? One of the things, and I brought this up at the workshop, is to what extent are we really working with the developer, Koelbel, on what their plans are for that area. They own it. We have to recognize that they do, and we need to find out what is their vision. Are they willing to buy into our vision? When I moved first moved here and I saw the icon that was mentioned earlier, that is the vision. The vision is to make it a money-making area in Louisville. I have no doubt in my mind about that. I think we need to get the developers in that area to understand that we are a community and that we have certain values. We have certain pillars that we want to uphold. Those developers need to buy into that vision. We need to find ways to get them to see the value of doing "our way". Any plans we make really aren't going to mean a whole lot unless we can get their "buy in". For example, the Rehab Center was spoken about but once again, that is another example of "is that being planfull" in that area? We have heard a lot about how many parking spaces are out there, how much space is being taken up with a lot of empty space. There are no greenways or the notion of greenways to get us to the transportation. We spent a tremendous amount of money on that transit site and we need to value that. We need to see it was a major investment on the City of Louisville's part to build that transit center and to share the cost with Superior. We are not really taking advantage of it. We are not creating transportation corridors, bicycle corridors, walking paths, and other ways for people to get to that transit site and back to their homes. They have chosen to live here and we need to provide them the means to get back to their homes and their families. We need to show that we value it when we are in discussion with the various developers and their plans for those locations. We've created open space up on Davidson Mesa which I enjoy tremendously because I'm a big runner. I want more spaces like that but I also want to promote business. The other thing mentioned earlier this evening was about having commercial fronts and residential in the back. The whole idea of having back and fronts to a lot of these businesses means people can get to businesses both from the back side (west side) as well as from the east side. That would give the sense of community and the value to have people walking past those businesses to be able to enter the businesses.

Summary and request by Staff and Applicant:

Robinson states that the Opportunities and Constraints can be analyzed and recommendations can be made.

Moline says that when the South Boulder Plan was discussed, was there an economic analysis of that corridor?

Robinson says there will be a fiscal analysis in the South Boulder Road once three endorsed alternatives are completed. There will be discussion of fiscal benefits in Principle 4, (c).

Planning Commission
Meeting Minutes
April 9, 2015
Page 24 of 27

Russell says he doesn't think that is the question Comm. Moline is asking. The fiscal aspect is one thing, but to get to the question of "do we have the appropriate data around demographics and economic issues" is a whole separate question. Do we have that sort of information on South Boulder Road?

Robinson says there was no additional information. There was a market study done as part of the Comp Plan which is 2-3 years old. The ULI Tap gave some broader market analysis. We do not have any additional market information.

Russ says South Boulder Road had a Developers Round Table that the Business Retention and Development Committee discussed, and they gave their perspective of South Boulder Road. The Business Retention is a collaborative board looking at economic alternatives as a part of this. They are proposing of putting together a similar economic round table for McCaslin. McCaslin has been thought through more than South Boulder Road. South Boulder Road only had the Comp Plan's market study that was city-wide, looking at overall yield. They did look at each quadrant of the City, and they had the Developers Round Table. We did not have a separate market study. In this one separate market study, we utilized the ULI Tap panel and had market experts and investors in, and they gave us their perspective. This is the only market components that have been done to date.

Moline is concerned about what is happening to the south in the Superior Town Center. This is could really affect what happens on this north side of US 36. Will we have some studies or some reports that will help us in our assessment of Louisville's side should be complimentary or reacting to what is happening to the south.

Robinson says Staff has the plans for the Superior Town Center so Staff will look at those and try to assess what the impacts will be. What additional traffic will we see? What additional residents are now going in the market capture area? What businesses are going to be over there and could take business from our existing ones?

Russ says the ULI panel also had the Superior Town Center as a component. They knew the program, they gave their inputs to it as a part of it. The fiscal model, just to remind everyone, has a City revenue sharing agreement for the retail portion of the Superior Town Center. There is actually revenue outside the City that the City will be generating. The question is really to market and how do the new rooftops of the Superior Town Center impact Louisville, and vice versa. Is there new information that we need to get? The Developers Round Table will get us up to speed with what ULI left us with.

O'Connell wants to know more about the history of how Louisville has some big boxes and Superior on the south got big boxes. Was there competition originally between Louisville and Superior, and did Louisville lose? Is there a trend here? Is there a reason that any big boxes would come back to fill the spots, or is the reality that Louisville is a city with roughly 19,000 people and no market?

Russ says Staff can prepare a history for Centennial Valley and present it at overflow or at a future session as part of Small Area Planning. He says it wasn't Superior that beat out Louisville. It was Broomfield, Boulder, Superior, and Lafayette. Louisville was never a crossroads town; we were always a resource town. Main Street was not on US 36. When US 36 came in, McCaslin was built and Crossroads Mall in Boulder was the story. Centennial Valley was a key catalyst in damaging Crossroads. We were the regional alternative with Sam's Club, Home Depot, and Eagle Hardware. Then Flatirons Mall was built and leveled Crossroads Mall. Home Depot was still the only one. Then 29th Street's Home Depot in Boulder damaged the Louisville Home Depot revenue sales. Lafayette brought in Wal-Mart on Hwy 287. Broomfield brought in Wal-Mart. Superior brought in Costco and it was the death blow to Sam's Club. We know through the market study for the Comp Plan what the rooftops are and what they generate. We know through the ULI study how Superior Town Center impacts it. We don't

know the latest thinking and this is the reason to bring everyone back together with the BRAD committee to have the same conversation.

Pritchard says that in some of the discussions with BRAD and various others, the commercial retail and age of the big box is gone. They do not see it coming back. The example is to look at Broomfield and how many square feet have been torn down at Flatirons. That may be just the beginning. To get a retailer to come into these 130,000 square foot buildings will be difficult. Retailers are looking at half that footprint. In dealing with retail "rings", it is 5 miles. Wal-Mart is about every 5 miles.

Closed Public Hearing and discussion by Commission:

Pritchard says he thinks there is a Constraint that is overlooked. It is same Constraint that was in the South Boulder Road Small Area Plan. Our own citizens are a Constraint. We have people talking open space when we have no control over it because it is privately owned. There is a misconception that because it has been under-utilized for over 20 years, that in de facto, citizens feel it is open space. Pritchard sees this comment made frequently and he believes it is inaccurate. There is a lack of continuity among our citizens as to what is the best use and the best direction for McCaslin Blvd. and the valley itself.

Pritchard asks, beginning with opportunities, does the PC think they are accurate?

Moline says that schools are an Opportunity. When the school district passes a large bond issue, he is confident they will find a way to accommodate growth. He does not see it as a Constraint.

Russ says that this corridor is served by Coal Creek, Fireside, and Monarch K-8. Monarch K-8 has similar constraints to LES (Louisville Elementary School), but Fireside and Coal Creek are significantly under capacity. LES is above capacity. In every referral we receive, they give us all four school capacities. Russ clarifies that current Louisville population is just over 19,000.

Russell says the adjacency of housing to this corridor is an Opportunity. It is not an impactful as some other areas, but there is a substantial amount of residential population that is within walking distance of portions of the corridor.

Brauneis says the McCaslin corridor is under-performing from a commercial property owner perspective and because it hasn't been built on is an Opportunity. We are not dealing with many abandoned buildings as seen in rust-belt areas. It is an Opportunity unto itself. Robinson says they tried to address that in both Opportunities and Constraints. Several areas ready for investment.

Pritchard states any unused building is a problem. An example is Chili's which will be unoccupied for two years because they have a lease and are getting paid. This is the type of issue we are dealing with. We have an issue with Sam's Club. There is more than enough land and it is currently zoned. Pritchard says housing can be an Opportunity and a Constraint. We have some housing now but we may not have as much as we need to support businesses.

Russell speaks about making the corridor more pedestrian friendly and it is irrelevant if you have no pedestrians. You have pedestrians if you have housing. The social infrastructure is present to support continued growth and development.

O'Connell wants to add another potential Opportunity. This corridor has the proximity as the only area for visitors to stay at hotels. Because the hotels are zoned with all of them "clumped" together, there is no incentive for anyone to walk farther than a block away from them. Is there

Planning Commission
Meeting Minutes
April 9, 2015
Page 26 of 27

an Opportunity to bring in more hotels? There are so many businesses in that area that attract people from out of the area as well as a major hospital present.

Pritchard states their location along US 36 does not hurt. The view corridor from the highway is highly valued. That was the original thought when they began clustering and building over 18 years ago. Pritchard does not know if any hotels are coming into Superior.

O'Connell states this is an Opportunity because this is the only place to stay in Louisville.

Rice does not think that the citizens are a Constraint. The Constraint is the inability to drive consensus. This process is about trying to develop consensus on how this corridor will be developed. The citizens are an important resource to that whole discussion. He has attended the meetings and has been amazed at the amount of participation that occurs. It is impressive.

Pritchard says he looks at their comments and they say "I want open space".

Moline says the Constraint could be along the lines of perception that vacant land is open space.

Russell says referring back to South Boulder Road, there was talk about lack of community consensus as a Constraint. It was much more about the intent of that corridor, walkability versus traffic, and getting cars from one end to the other. It is a linear corridor. There is no question about the traffic intent of McCaslin and what is happening in the "fatter" area around it. How do we create a more vibrant community? Lack of common agreement on the purpose of the corridor on South Boulder Road is a different issue than what we are encountering on McCaslin.

Russell discusses the design of the parking lots and internal circulation on McCaslin. Curbs and pavement and street are difficult to change. He says that ULI reports are always controversial. He agrees that introducing a stronger grid in this area would be great, but it is an incredible challenge. We are suggesting scraping significant public infrastructure. Perhaps this is captured in "outdated site and building designs" as a Constraint.

Pritchard says the history of Centennial Valley was that it was supposed to be the location of the mall. There is a "ring" design there. The problem with the Valley is it has always been an after-thought. It was supposed to be something and then something else. They were trying to find uses for it in this community. This is why there is a traffic issue. Trying to put in new streets would be very expensive.

Moline says there have been comments about signage and does this fall into the "outdated site and building designs"?

Pritchard says that signage has been updated and it has been an ongoing problem. Staff has been making an effort to change and give exceptions. There are some new monument signs. Much of the landscape installed in the past is now mature. Some vegetation has been removed because buildings were not visible from the street. Pritchard agrees that signage is a Constraint. Robinson says that Staff can add signage specifically to the Constraints.

O'Connell says that a Constraint could be that the entire west side of the corridor is bordered by open space. Development is hemmed in by McCaslin on the east and Open Space on the west. Robinson says they tried to capture that in Constraint "Market capture area limited by street, network, regional competition, and open space".

Moline mentions traffic as a Constraint and asks if it really the traffic or the volume and speed? Traffic is also listed as an Opportunity. What is the difference?

Russ says a more accurate description is needed. Traffic volume presents the potential for opportunity for business. Traffic speed makes it unpleasant as it creates higher noise.

Pritchard stops discussion after Opportunities and Constraints because it is after 10:00 pm.

Items Scheduled for the Overflow Meeting: April 23, 2015:

- Small Area Plan South Boulder Road (Alternatives) Item moved to overflow meeting on April 23, 2015
- Small Area Plan McCaslin (Measures of Success) Discussion of Principles moved to overflow meeting on April 23, 2015.

Planning Commission Comments

Pritchard states that two members, Moline and O'Connell, cannot attend the April 23 meeting. Pritchard, Brauneis, Russell, and Rice say they can attend. Staff will contact Comm. Tengler about his availability. Staff requests that South Boulder Road be discussed first. Comm. Rice asks if the members who cannot attend can forward their concerns to Staff in the interim and attending members can raise them.

Staff Comments None.

Items Tentatively Scheduled for the regular meeting: May 14, 2015:

- ➤ Boulder County Housing Authority: A request for a Preliminary Plat and Planned Unit Development (PUD) for 231 residential units and 18,404 square feet of commercial development on 13.404 acres. Case #15-002-PS/PP
 - Applicant, Owner and Representative: Boulder County Housing Authority
 - Case Manager: Troy Russ, Director of Planning and Building Safety
- ➤ Dahlia Office Building A request for a PUD amendment to add a 698 square foot addition, remove existing vestibule, reconfigure sidewalk, and redesign vehicular circulation, located at 480 W. Dahlia Street. Case No. 15-004-FP.
 - Applicant and Representative: MKL Architecture, PC
 - Owners: Luan Holdings, LLC
 - Case Manager: Lauren Trice, Planner I
- ➤ Comcast Replat A request for a minor replat to the existing Industrial Area Subdivision located at 1055 E. Lafavette Street. Case No. 15-007-FS.
 - Applicant and Owner: Comcast Cable Corp.
 - Representative: RMCS, Inc.
 - Case Manager: Sean McCartney, Principal Planner

Adjourn

Rice made motion to adjourn, seconded by Brauneis. Pritchard adjourned meeting at 10:15 pm. Adjourn.